UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/553,488	08/09/2006	Steven Weber	ESSR:098US/10510809	1295	
	7590 06/05/200 & JAWORSKI L.L.P.	9	EXAMINER		
600 CONGRES	SS AVE.		LEE, DANIEL H.		
SUITE 2400 AUSTIN, TX 78701			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1791		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/05/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commons	10/553,488	WEBER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	DANIEL LEE	1791				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	<b>J.</b> nely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	- action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	<del>-</del>					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>64-127</u> is/are pending in the application	on.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.	·					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) 64-127 are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P7	ГО-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f)				
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	priority arraor to the start 3 mo(a)	(4) 5. (.).				
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.					
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents		on No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been receive	ed in this National	Stage			
application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(a)						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) [ Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/553,488 Page 2

Art Unit: 1791

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 64-82, drawn to the composition.

Group II, claim(s) 83-117, drawn to the process of transferring a coating from a support onto a surface of a thermoplastic material substrate.

Group III, claim(s) 118-125, drawn to the overmolding process.

Group IV, claim(s) 126-127, drawn to the process for making laminated thermoplastic articles.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I, II, III, and IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The common technical feature is: 5 to 60 wt% of at least one mono or polyacrylate monomer or oligomer (A), 5 to 60 wt% of at least one thio(meth)acrylate monomer or oligomer (B), and 20 to 50 wt% of at least one aromatic dimethacrylate monomer or oligomer (C); with the proviso that the composition does not contain a brominated monofunctional acrylate. However, this technical feature is not a special technical feature as it does not make a contribution over the prior art in view of Suyal et al. (US 2003/0114619). Suyal et al.

("Suyal") teaches a polymer containing the special technical feature discussed above. See Examples 4-6 of Suyal and the claims. For instance, in example 5, Suyal teaches a polymer with 55 wt% of (A) (para. [0054]; 2.75 g hexane dimethacrylate), 20 wt% of (B) (para. [0054]; 1.0g phenylthioethyl acrylate), and 25 wt% of (C) (para. [0054]; 1.25 g bisphenol A dimethacrylate).

Page 3

3. A telephone call was made to Mark Wilson on June 2, 2009 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1791

5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL LEE whose telephone number is (571)270-

Application/Control Number: 10/553,488 Page 5

Art Unit: 1791

7711. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30-5:00,

alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571)272-1226. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. L./

Examiner, Art Unit 1791

/Joseph S. Del Sole/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791